



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

NEW TESTAMENT AND PATRISTICS

BURRAGE, CHAMPLIN. *Nazareth and the Beginnings of Christianity. A New View Based upon Philological Evidence.* Oxford: Horace Hart, 1914. 68 pages. 3s. 6d.

The point of this essay is a little difficult to catch. The author maintains, with great oratorical emphasis, that the earliest Christians were called Nazarenes and later Ebionites, and that ecclesiastical writers were mistaken in calling them heretics. From their residence around Pella, he decides that Nazareth must be sought to the east of the Jordan, and that this district (not a city) is meant in Matt. 2:23. By an equation "Nazarene" = "Nazirite," he finds that Matt. 2:23 refers to Judg. 13:5, a not impossible conjecture. He also announces that "Nazarites" and "Essenes" were convertible terms, and that Paul knew and quoted the Gospel of the Hebrews or its tradition. Lengthy appendices contain a useful collection of passages bearing on his argument, although more critical texts might have been employed. The general impression given by the monograph is that its author is not fully acquainted with modern literature on the New Testament, an impression that is not improved when the writer calls certain readings "unnoticed."

B. S. E.

BURNSIDE, W. F. *The Gospel according to St. Luke.* Cambridge: University Press, 1913. xxxvi+272 pages. 3s. net.

This volume is sufficiently characterized by the words of the preface, "I have endeavored to make the notes as brief as possible and to keep notes upon grammar and language in a strictly subordinate position. . . . I have used Dr. A. Wright's edition of St. Luke and Dr. Plummer's commentary as the basis of my work." The readers presupposed are older schoolboys, interested only in classical syntax and so well grounded in Greek as to be able to read the Gospel merely for edification. Unfortunately, very few schools in the United States contain such pupils.

B. S. E.

PARRY, R. ST. JOHN. *Romans* (Cambridge Greek Testament). Cambridge: University Press, 1912. xlix+243 pages. 3s. 6d.

JAMES, MONTAGUE RHODES. *2nd Peter and Jude* (Cambridge Greek Testament). Cambridge: University Press, 1912. lix+45 pages. 2s. 6d.

Mr. Parry has written a commentary on *Romans* that strikes the reader as in the main a condensation of Sanday and Headlam, although there are various evidences of independent judgment. Doubt may arise, however, as to the value of a commentary of this sort in giving to younger students much idea of the problems that *Romans* discusses; less detail in the notes and a broader discussion of Pauline theology in the introduction would have been an improvement. And in a semi-popular work of this kind it is curious to find the excellent popular commentaries of Gore, Garvie, and Jülicher omitted from the bibliography. Dr. James has done better popularizing work in his volume, which is provided with an excellent introduction. But great awkwardness is created by taking *2nd Peter* first, although its dependence on *Jude* is fully recognized. And the book contains no bibliography at all.

B. S. E.